## REMARKS

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1, 3-8, 10-30, 32-34, 36-39, 41-44, 51-53, 55-63, and 69 will still be pending. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

Applicants submit, with this Response, amendments to the Specification, to correct an administrative error in the filing of this application and make pages 3 and 4 consistent with pages 3 and 4 of the parent application. No prohibited new matter is being added, as the new text is supported by pages 2 – 4 of the parent application of this case, which was properly incorporated by reference at the time of filing of this case.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11-16, 19-30, 32-33, 36-39, 41-44, 51-53, 55-63, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,931,633 (Vazquez et al.). Claims 4, 10, 17, 18, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vazquez et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,915,273 (Parulski).

The Office Action states that Vazquez et al. disclose that the system may include two remote computers (see, for example, the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action). The Office Action also states that the memory medium may be in a first computer or in a second different computer which connects to the first computer over a network. (See, for example, the third paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action).

Applicants note that the Vazquez et al. patent (including those very portions of Vazquez et al. referenced in the Office Action) do not seem to sufficiently support the statements in the rejection.

-16-

For example, at page 3, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, where there are references to column 12, line 50 and to column 15, lines 1-31 of Vazquez et al., do not appear to support the assertions made. Particularly, the text at column 12, line 50 does not talk about a host computer 102 connecting to one or more instruments, nor does it describe a host computer having a CPU, a display screen, and a memory. In addition, the specification of Vazquez et al. at column 15, lines 1-33 does not describe a memory medium which may be located on the second computer.

Applicants note that Vazquez et al. describe an image processing prototyping environment, which can be used to create a machine vision program. The program, once created, is then run in a real time system, for example, as shown in Fig. 1A or Fig. 1B.

The machine vision program, when it is being run in such a real time system, is run on a computer 102.

Computer 102 connects to one or more instruments, for example, including instruments to analyze, measure, or control a unit under test or process 150. Per the example in Fig. 1A, instruments are described, for example, at column 5, lines 46-54 of the Vazquez et al. patent.

Per Fig. 1B, computer 102 may be connected through one or more devices to a processor device 150 to perform an automation function. The one or more devices, for example, are described at column 6, lines 48-58 of the Vazquez et al. patent.

The Examiner asserts, at page 3, in the last paragraph of the Office Action, that the Vazquez et al. patent discloses that the system may include two remote computers, thus "sending via communications network". In this regard, the Examiner refers to portions of the Vazquez et al. patent, including column 3, line 7, column 9, lines 31-33, column 10, lines 3-14, column 10, lines 19-21, column 11, and column 12, lines 65-66.

-17-

Applicants do not understand how these portions of the Vazquez et al. patent relate to the idea of having two "remote computers". With this said, however, Applicants refer to the disclosure by Vazquez et al., at column 7, lines 23-28. At this portion of the Vazquez et al. patent, the following is stated:

> "...the memory medium may be located in a first computer in which the programs are executed, or may be located in a second different computer which connects to the first computer over a network, such as the Internet. In the latter instance, the second computer provides the program instructions to the first computer for execution...."

Applicants note that each of independent claims now pending, i.e., independent claims 1, 19, 39, 51, and 69, recites, among other limitations, sending (or receiving), via a communications network, image data, an indication of a selected vision tool, and at least one vision tool parameter corresponding to the vision tool, from one computer to a remotely located other computer that includes the vision tool.

This information, that is sent from one computer to another computer, includes image data, an indication of a vision tool that was selected for operation on the image data, and at least one vision tool parameter corresponding to the selected vision tool.

Vazquez et al. fail to teach these limitations, and no other references of record (including Parulski), alone or any proper combination, remedies these deficiencies of Vazquez et al.

Applicants' independent claims do not recite the mere use of more than one computer to perform processing. In contrast, Applicants recite limitations involving the sending of image data, of an indication of vision tool that was selected by user, and also of at least one vision tool parameter corresponding to the selected vision tool. A remote computer processes the image data using the vision tool to produce a result and sends the result to a designated location.

-18-

At most, Vazquez et al. teach, for example, at column 7, lines 23-35, that program code can be remotely stored. For example, a second computer could provide the program instructions to a first computer for execution as stated at column 7, lines 26-28. In addition, the Vazquez et al. patent might be said to suggest that more than one processor may be provided for implementing a particular computer system, which executes instructions from a memory medium.

There is no disclosure, even inherent or implicit, in the Vazquez et al. patent of sending via a communications network, from a computer to a remotely located other computer, image data, an indication of the vision tool that was selected, and at least one vision tool parameter corresponding to the vision tool.

The present application explains, for example, at page 2, lines 14-19, of the present Specification, that it is difficult for users to maintain machine vision systems in the field. For example, it may be challenging to update a machine vision system to a new version of software, or a new license, after it has been installed on a manufacturing production line. Moreover, customers wishing to test proprietary machine vision software on a particular part may not want to have to purchase and install the software and the associated licenses. The need to purchase and install the software and its associated licenses can therefore become a significant deterrent to "quick turn" software development.

Applicants have included limitations in the independent claims which help solve this problem recognized by Applicants. Meanwhile, Vazquez et al. fail to teach these limitations that solve a stated problem.

At column 7, lines 26-28, Vazquez et al. suggest the possibility that a program can be remotely stored in one computer, which provides instructions to another computer for execution.

-19-

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**MAY 27 2008**

This does not inherently, impliedly, or otherwise, suggest the recited limitations of sending (or receiving), from one computer to a remote computer, image data, an indication of the vision tool that was selected, and at least one vision tool parameter corresponding to the vision tool.

Parulski merely teaches a method for providing customized digital printing services over a network, and provides no teaching of the claim limitations Vazquez et al. already lacks.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that each of the claims in the present application is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. A Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _5/26/08_

Anthony L. Miele, Attorney for Applicants
Registration Number 34,393
Customer Number 23459 (Cognex Corp.)
Miele Law Group PC
36 Lovering Street
Medway, MA 02053
Phone: 508-315-3677     Fax: 508-319-3001